

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILI | NG DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO |
|--------------------------------------|----------|------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| 10/015,011 | 12. | /11/2001 | Michael Gauselmann | M-12388 US | 2090 |
| 32566 | 7590 | 05/04/2004 | | EXAMINER | |
| PATENT L | | | MARKS, CHRISTINA M | | |
| 2635 NORTH FIRST STREET SUITE 223 | | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| SAN JOSE, | CA 95134 | | | 3713 | |
| | • | | | DATE MAILED: 05/04/2004 | 4 |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Advisory Action | 10/015,011 | GAUSELMANN, MICHAEL | | | | | |
| Advisory Action | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | | |
| | C. Marks | 3713 | | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address | | | | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 14 April 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THI Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | oid abandonment of this applicated abandonment of this applicated application application about the control of | ation. A proper reply to a n places the application in | | | | | |
| PERIOD FOR RE | EPLY [check either a) or b)] | | | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailin b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office | Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply | g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension out of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or | | | | | |
| timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C | CFR 1.704(b). | | | | | | |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF | | | | | | | |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be | ecause: | | | | | | |
| (a) \(\square\) they raise new issues that would require further | er consideration and/or search (s | see NOTE below); | | | | | |
| (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b | elow); | | | | | | |
| (c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or | n better form for appeal by mate | rially reducing or simplifying the | | | | | |
| (d) they present additional claims without canceli | ng a corresponding number of fi | nally rejected claims. | | | | | |
| NOTE: | ion(s): | | | | | | |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would | | enarate timely filed amendment | | | | | |
| canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | | | | | | | |
| 5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: Se | reconsideration has been consi <u>e Continuation Sheet</u> . | dered but does NOT place the | | | | | |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bec raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. | ause it is not directed SOLELY t | o issues which were newly | | | | | |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we | | | | | | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: 1-11,13-30 and 32-35. | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 12 and 33. | | | | | | | |
| 8. The drawing correction filed on <u>14 April 2004</u> is a) | ☑ approved or b)☐ disapprov | ed by the Examiner. | | | | | |
| 9. \square Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement | nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s) | | | | | | |
| 10. Other: | | | | | | | |
| | Toro | ssa aasidəld | | | | | |
| | Supervisor G | ry Patent Examiner roup 3700 | | | | | |

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03)

¥

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: While the Examiner has considered the arguments presented by the Applicant, the arguments are not convincing. Specifically the Examiner respectully disagress with the Applicant's argument that the attract mode of Brossard does not constitute operation of the gaming machine. The attract mode is a specific stage of operation just as regular mode and bonus mode are.